# REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **18 December 2006**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-37. Claims 1, 6, 8-9, 13, 18, 20-21, 25, 30, 32-33, and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Miller (USPN 6,597,358 hereinafter "Miller"). Claims 2-3, 7, 10-11, 14-15, 19, 22-23, 26-27, 31 and 34-35, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, in view of Horvitz et al. (USPN 5,880,733, hereinafter "Horvitz").

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2-3, 7, 10-11, 14-15, 19, 22-23, 26-27, 31, and 34-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller in view of Horvitz. Applicant respectfully points out that Miller is fundamentally distinct from the embodiments of the present invention because the Miller system is confined to rendering 2D application windows on the surfaces of a 3D object.

In the system disclosed by Miller, a computer system maps conventionally displayed application windows into a three-dimensional environment such that the contents of each window are transformed into respective "3D" application window (see Miller, col. 5, lines 14-23 and FIG. 4). The system disclosed by Miller uses common rendering techniques to display the application windows using "3D meta-visualization" (see Miller, col. 4, lines 63-66).

In FIG. 4, as cited by the Examiner, Miller provides an illustration of "a perspective depicting the transformation of conventionally displayed application windows to a 3D meta-visualization of the computer applications on the display" (see Miller, col. 4, lines 63-66). In other words, Miller is presenting FIG. 4 to illustrate the 3D perspective of a group of application windows as those windows are transformed into the 3D visualization. Neither Miller or Horvitz, alone or in concert, discloses freely **rotating the individual windows within the 3D space.**

In contrast, embodiments of the present invention provide position and rotation attributes with application windows (see par. [0059] of the instant application). The attributes specify rotations of window around horizontal and vertical axis (see par. [0053] of the instant application). Using these attributes, the system can "**rotate objects within the 3D display**" around a viewpoint or another point within the 3D model (see par. [0061] of the instant application). There is not a predetermined rotation or a predetermined location for rotated windows, so the windows are rotated "to an **oblique angle**," meaning that the system can rotate application windows within the 3D space to provide the most efficient window arrangement (see par. [0064] of the instant application).

Applicant respectfully points out that although Miller discloses presenting 2D application windows on an object in a 3D environment, nothing within Miller or Horvitz discloses **freely rotating** the application windows within the 3D space. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 to clarify that the present system can rotate the application windows around horizontal and vertical axis. These amendments find support in par. [0053] of the instant application. Applicant has also added new claims 38-40. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, 25, and 37 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-3 and 5-12, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-15 and 17-24, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-27 and 29-36, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

## CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Shun Yao
Registration No. 59,242

Date:   14 February 2007

Shun Yao
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1667
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: shun@parklegal.com